



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,465	07/11/2001	Kirk Steven Tecu	10016935-1	9335

7590

12/01/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SAFAIPOUR, HOUSHANG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2627

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/903,465	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TECU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Houshang Safaipoor	<b>Art Unit</b> 2627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 13-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 13, 14 and 17-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 15 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's amendment filed on October 3, 2005 has been entered and made of record.

Applicant's arguments with regards to claims 1 and 13 have been considered, but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1, 2, 3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kurosawa et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,714,324).

Regarding claim 1, Kurosawa et al. discloses a template for a scanner system, the template comprising:

Art Unit: 2627

a template body (fig. 4, 201a and 201b) adapted to receive a media object to be scanned, and

an element for generating an optical pattern when scanned in the scanner system, the optical pattern indicating a particular scan routine for scanning the media object (fig. 4, element 206a or 206b).

Regarding claim 2, Kurosawa et al. discloses the template according to claim 1, wherein the template further comprises an insert area for receiving a transparent media therein (fig. 4, insert areas 203a or 203b).

Regarding claim 3, Kurosawa et al. discloses the template according to claim 1, wherein the element is a pattern printed on the template body (fig. 4, bar codes 206a or 206b).

Regarding claim 5, Kurosawa et al. discloses the template according to claim 1, wherein the element is an aperture on the template body (fig. 1, 204a or 204b)

Regarding claim 6, Kurosawa et al. discloses the template according to claim 1, wherein the optical pattern is comparable to one or more reference patterns stored in a computer (col. 5, lines 10-33).

Regarding claim 7, Kurosawa et al. discloses the template according to claim 6, wherein the computer directs the scanner system to execute a scan routine upon determining a match between the optical pattern and one of the reference patterns (controller 140, col. 6, lines 19-65).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurosawa et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,714,324).

Kurosawa does not disclose expressly a tab connected to an edge of the template body.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to connect the tab to the edge of the template. Applicant has not disclosed that the tab provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose or solves a stated problem. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify Huang's apparatus to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4 and 19.

Claims 13, 14, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (U.S. Patent No. 6,850,344) and further in view of Kurosawa et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,714,324).

Regarding claim 13, Chang discloses a scanner system for optically scanning a media, the scanner system comprising: a reflective scanner comprising a platen, a lamp, an optic system and one or more photosensitive devices; a transparent media adapter comprising a housing and operable to backlight a transparent media; and a template comprising an element for generating an optical pattern when scanned in the scanner system (figs. 1 & 2, col. 3, lines 41-58).

Kurosawa discloses a template adapted to receive a media for scanning (please refer to claim 1).

Art Unit: 2627

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Chang's invention with that of Kurosawa to have the media for scanning secured in the template.

Regarding claim 14, Chang discloses the scanner system according to claim 13, wherein the scanner system is coupled to a computer, the computer storing one or more reference patterns each associated with a scan routine, the scanner system performing a reflective scan over a predefined distance of carriage translation and transmitting imaged data obtained by the reflective scan to the computer, the computer operable to compare the imaged data with the reference patterns (figs. 1 & 2, col. 3, lines 41-58).

Regarding claims 17 and 18, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 3 and 5 are applicable to claims 17 and 18 respectively.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 15 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Contact Information***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Houshang Safaipoor whose telephone number is (571)272-7412. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 6:30am to 5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2627

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles, Sr. can be reached on (571)272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Houshang Safaipoor  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2622  
November 23, 2005

  
EDWARD COLES  
SENIOR PATENT EXAMINER  
EBC CENTER 2622